

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



World Health  
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

Agenda Item 13

CRD02

July 2022

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

53rd Session

(Virtual)

4-8 July and 13 July 2022

### ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR

(prepared by Australia as Chair of the Electronic Working Group on Priorities)

#### A. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS 2023-2024 & BEYOND

1. Appendix A includes the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides (Tables 1-4) as specified in the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) Procedural Manual "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)". Thanks to members of the eWG for their contributions to development of these lists.

#### B. FINALISING THE 2023 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

2. To assist consideration of scheduling for 2023, the proposed 2023 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations is extracted from Tables 1 and 2A and appears in three worksheets with the prefix '2023'.
3. The '2023 new cpd' worksheet lists six compounds in the 2023 new compound proposed schedule. National registrations have been confirmed for all six of the listed compounds.
4. The '2023 new use – other' worksheet lists fifteen nominations for new use. Of those fifteen nominations, evidence of product labels / national registration has been provided for fourteen compounds. The commodities for these are listed in upper case text.
5. The '2023 periodrev' worksheet lists five compounds that were included in the proposed 2023 Schedule of Periodic Reviews prior to CCPR53. During plenary of CCPR53, the Committee decided to revoke CXLs for chlorpyrifos and to maintain the chemical for periodic review in 2023, following an indication of support by AgroCare. CCPR53 agreed to defer periodic review of chlorpyrifos-methyl until 2024. This modification will allow inclusion of 1-2 compounds into the '2023 periodrev' worksheet.
6. The CCPR53 has reached agreement concerning CXLs and draft MRLs that the JMPR will be required to address at future meetings. The Committee agreed to apply the 4-year rule for metalaxyl/metalaxyl-M (multiple CXLs), trifloxystrobin (citrus fruits group) and fipronil (all CXLs). For fenpyroximate the 4-year rule will apply (multiple CXLs). Also, the JMPR will consider alternative GAP for bifenthrin on lettuce, head. A concern form relating to reviews of benomyl, carbendazim and thiophanate-methyl will likely be resolved by the periodic re-evaluation of carbendazim which was scheduled for 2022 by CCPR52.
7. Despite the JMPR's best efforts to conduct evaluations under very difficult circumstances, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused delays and a consequent backlog of evaluations.

**C. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS**

8. In accordance with the nomination process described in the Codex Procedural Manual “Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues”, Members and Observers may lodge public health concerns (PHC) for any compound in the CCPR Pesticide List including those already listed in Tables 2A and 2B. In lodging a public health concern, the nominator must provide supporting scientific data. JMPR will assess the PHC nominations and advise CCPR if a periodic review is supported. The EU has raised a PHC for terbufos in comments on Agenda Items 5(b) and 6.

**D. UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS DESIGNATED FOR DELETION FROM CCPR PESTICIDE LIST**

9. There are several compounds from previous schedules of periodic reviews which were not evaluated by JMPR and appear to be unsupported: amitraz (122), fenbutatin oxide (109), carbaryl (8), 2-phenylphenol (56), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), bitertanol (144), terbufos (167) and fenthion (39); fenthion was scheduled for periodic review in 2022. One member country has recently indicated support for carbaryl in mangosteen, longan, mango.
10. A decision relating to ongoing retention on the CCPR List of Pesticides and maintenance of existing CXLs may be made regarding these unsupported compounds at this meeting. Further discussion concerning the management of unsupported compounds may assist CCPR to reach a decision regarding these compounds.

**E. PERIODIC REVIEWS (UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS)**

11. Member countries and Observers are strongly encouraged to review Tables 2A and 2B and if wishing to support a compound, should provide advice on availability of toxicology and residue trials data packages.

**F. NOMINATION OF COMPOUND FOR PARALLEL REVIEW**

12. The CCPR52 agreed to encourage sponsors to nominate compounds for a pilot parallel review. As part of the CCPR Schedules and Priorities work data sponsors were advised of the opportunity to nominate compounds for the parallel review pilot. A call for nominations was made through the Schedules and Priorities EWG. No nominations were received.

**G. RECOMMENDATIONS**

13. In light of the current evaluation backlog, it is recommended that the current Priority and Schedule lists for 2023 are not endorsed at this time for submission to the Commission in 2022. Instead, the lists would be relabelled 2024, to be further discussed at CCPR54.
14. The current list of unsupported compounds could be forwarded to the future work program of the eWG on Unsupported Compounds.
15. The Committee is invited to endorse continuation of the electronic working group to prepare the Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides for the next session of CCPR in 2024, working in English and chaired by Australia. This eWG will also call for nominations to the Parallel Review pilot.

## APPENDIX A

2023 - NEW COMPOUND EVALUATIONS										
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA			COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ	FAO NOMINATION FORM RECEIVED?				
2023	1/12/2020	Carfentrazone	Carfentrazone	Yes	Yes	Yes	WHEAT, BARLEY, SORGHUM, RICE, COTTON, SUNFLOWER, BEANS, PEAS	Wheat (14), Barley (0, supported by wheat trials), Sorghum (10), Rice (10), Cotton (15), Sunflower (5), Beans (5), Peas (11)	USA/FMC	Requested by USA 01 December 2020. On 2 April 2022, FMC confirmed preparedness for evaluation in 2023.
2023	2/12/2019	SYN522 (Cyclobutrifluram)	SYN522 (Cyclobutrifluram)	Yes	Yes	Yes (from Canada)	Soybean, corn, vegetables (fruiting cucurbit), fruit and potato	Soybean (20-US), corn (20 field-US; 4 popcorn-US), potato (6-CAN, 10-US, 6-Arg), tomato (16-US, 6-Arg), cucumber (8-US), squash (8-US), melon (8-US), watermelon (8-GUA).	Canada/Syngenta	To be submitted December 2021; first registrations Guatemala/Argentina in September 2021. Other countries to follow (USA, Canada, Brazil, Mexico, China, Japan, India, Korea). Requested to be moved to 2023. Honduras label provided 3 June 2021.
2023	21/04/2021	Fenpropidin	Fenpropidin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Banana (FI 0327), cereals (GC 0080), soybean (VD 0541), sugarbeet (VR 0596), grapes (FB 0269)	Bananas (23), barley (18), wheat (18), soybean (1), grapes (6)	Syngenta	Requested on 21 April 2021 as lower priority than cyclobutrifluram. Product registered but approved labels were not submitted in the eWG portal. Labels provided 17 September 2021.
2023	29/08/2018	Fluoxapiprolin (BCS-CS55621)	Fluoxapiprolin (BCS-CS55621)	Yes	Yes	Yes	POTATOES, TOMATO, ONION	Potatoes (9 + 3 processing), Tomato (13 + 3 processing), Onion (9)	Bayer AG, Division Crop Science	Fungicide; was not in JMPR data call in for 2020 so moved to 2021. In November 2019 the company requested this move to 2022 schedule. 10 June 2021 moved to 2023 schedule on request from company.
2023	7/11/2017	XDE-659 (florpylicoxamid)	XDE-659 (florpylicoxamid)	Yes	Yes (TBC 2019)	Yes	Cucumber, Melon, Squash, Grapes, Strawberry, Mango, Banana, Lettuce, Dry beans and peas, Lettuce, Pepper, Tomato, Canola, Wheat, Sugarbeets, Barley	Cucumber (18+ 8 GH), Melon (17), Squash (14), Grapes (42), Strawberry (19), Mango (8), Banana (26), Lettuce (24 + 8), Dry beans and peas (14+10), Sugarbeet (18), Pepper (24), Tomato (40 +8), Canola (22), Wheat (59), Barley (38)	Corteva / USA	Fungicide for 2023 schedule; Crops in red to be postponed to JMPR 2025 review of New Uses, barley has been added now to the list for 2023 review.
2023	25/11/2021	Florpyrauxifen-benzyl (XDE-848)	Florpyrauxifen-benzyl (XDE-848)	Yes	Yes	Yes	RICE, CORN, SOYBEAN, SUGARCANE, SUGAR BEET, PASTURE	Rice (59), corn (22), soybean (2), sugarcane (7), sugar beet (16), pasture (75 trials)	Corteva/USA	Registered for rice in Korea (2017) and other countries; registration in corn, sugarcane, sugar beet, soybeans in process in several countries. Nomination provided 25 November 2021 (Candidate for LPH category).
<b>TOTAL=6</b>										

2023 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2023	27/11/2019	NA	Dinotefuran (255)	Yes	Yes	SOYBEAN, GREEN TEA, PERSIMMON, PEAR, edible offal (mammalian), eggs, meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), milks, poultry meat, poultry, edible offal of, <b>Durian (F10334) (Thailand)</b>	soybean (25: USA, Brazil, Argentina, Japan), green tea (10: Japan), persimmon (5: Japan), pear (6 or more: Japan, Korea), edible offal (mammalian), eggs, meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), milks, poultry meat, poultry, edible offal of, <b>durian (6 trials-Thailand)</b>	Mitsui Chemicals Agro/ <b>Thailand</b>	On 08 December 2020, Mitsui requested deferral to 2022. Commodities also updated. On 22 December 2020 updates made to commodities and residue trials. On 23 July 2021 requested to defer to 2023. <b>Durian commodity added in CRD 21 CCPR53 by Thailand.</b>
2023	28/11/2019	NA	Tetraniliprole (324)	Yes	Yes	RICE (foliar)	Rice (12)	Bayer AG	Requested for 2022 JMPR review; 10 June 2021 company requested to move to 2023
2023	26/11/2019	NA	Buprofezin (173)	Yes	Yes	Rice	Rice (10+2 processing)	Republic of Korea	Requested for 2023 JMPR review
2023	26/11/2019	NA	Etofenprox (184)	Yes	Yes	Rice	Rice (10+2 processing)	Republic of Korea	Requested for 2023 JMPR review
2023	26/11/2019	NA	Flubendiamide (242)	Yes	Yes	Rice	Rice (10+2 processing)	Republic of Korea	Requested for 2023 JMPR review. 3 June 2022-previous strikeout seems to have been an error, so corrected here.
2023	26/11/2019	NA	Tebufenozide (196)	Yes	Yes	Rice	Rice (10+2 processing)	Republic of Korea	Requested for 2023 JMPR review. 3 June 2022-previous strikeout seems to have been an error, so corrected here.
2023		NA	Azoxystrobin (229)	Yes	Yes	AVOCADO (F10326), PINEAPPLE (F10353)	Avocado (4), Pineapple (4)	Syngenta	Requested for 2023 JMPR review; Updated 3 February 2022 on request from Syngenta to include avocado and pineapple (both registered). On 9 February 2022, WHO advised of a follow up tox evaluation for JMPR 2022 September session. On 15 April 2022 China withdrew this nomination; Syngenta's nominations remain.
2023		NA	Lambda-cyhalothrin (146)	Yes	Yes	Subgroup 1C Oranges, Sweet, Sour FC0004, Subgroup 1D Pummelos FC 0005, Subgroup 1A Lemons and Limes FC0002, ALFALFA	Citrus (16), Alfalfa (16)	Syngenta	Requested for 2023 JMPR review; Updated 3 February 2022 on request from Syngenta to include citrus and alfalfa (registered). On 15 April 2022 China withdrew their nominations; Syngenta's nominations remain.
2023		NA	Pyraziflumid (322)	TBD	Yes	Tree Nuts, Stone Fruit	Tree Nuts [12 total trials – pecan (6) and almond (6)], Stone Fruit [23 total trials – cherry (6), peach (9) and plum (8)]	USA/Nichino America, Inc (Nihon Nohyaku)	Requested by USA 01 December 2020; registered in Japan; US approval date December 2021.
2023	26/02/2021	NA	Pydiflumetofen (309)	Yes	Yes	BANANA (F10327) , MANDARINE (Subgroup 1B Mandarin FC 0003)	Banana (9) , Mandarine (16)	Syngenta	Requested and posted in EWG including approved label on 26 February 2021
2023	23/04/2021	NA	Acibenzolar (288)	Yes	Yes	PEAR (VO0445), CELERY (VS2080)	Pear (5), celery (6)	Syngenta	Requested and posted in EWG including approved label on 23 April 2021
2023	28/11/2017	NA	Flupyradifurone (285)	Yes	Yes	OLIVE, rapeseed	Olive (8), rapeseed (12 = 1 processing)	Bayer AG	On 10 June 2021 company cancelled sweet sorghum and date nomination and requested olives and rapeseed move to 2023.
2023	25/11/2021	NA	Spinosad (203)	Yes	Yes	Tea, mango	Tea, leaves (8 trials), mango (7 trials)	Corteva / Japan	Nomination provided 25 November 2021.
2023	3/02/2022	Cyproconazole (239)	Cyproconazole (239)	Yes	Yes	DRY BEAN SUB-GROUP (EXCEPT SOYBEAN) (VD 2065) and DRY PEA SUB-GROUP (VD 2066)	Dry bean and Dry pea (10)	Syngenta	Requested and posted in EWG including approved label on 02 February 2022. On 20 April 2022, Syngenta requested cyproconazole be moved to 2023.
2023	25/04/2022	NA	Novaluron (217)	Yes	Yes	TREE NUTS, <b>RICE</b>	Tree nuts (12 residue trials), <b>Rice (6)</b>	Adama/ <b>Thailand</b>	A top-up evaluation is requested following the approval of novaluron on tree nuts in USA to set a CXLs in line with the US MRL. <b>Rice commodity added in CRD 21 CCPR53 by Thailand.</b>
<b>TOTAL=15</b>									

2023 - PERIODIC REVIEW										
PRIORITY	YEAR	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMODITIES	COMMENTS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	JMPR RESPONSE
Decision of CCRP53 to revoke all CXLs but maintain chemical, awaiting data submission by AgroCare.	2023	Chlorpyrifos (17)	Chlorpyrifos (17)		Adama to advise on supported commodities.	Chlorpyrifos was originally evaluated by JMPR in 1972. It was evaluated for toxicology in 1982 by JMPR and for residues in 1995 and it was reviewed for toxicology in 1999 (confirmed ADI of 0-0.01 mg/kg bw and ARFD 0.1 mg/kg bw) and for residues in 2000, 2004 and 2006. There is a 20 years' gap since chlorpyrifos was last reviewed by JMPR, as it is also indicated in General considerations (point 2.6) of 2019 Report of the extra Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues. During the 2019 EU Peer Review of the active substance, and based on the information available from the European Food Safety Authority's Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment of the active substance chlorpyrifos, concerns were identified with regard to: •The genotoxic potential of chlorpyrifos which cannot be ruled out based on the information available: positive findings were found in an in vitro chromosome aberration study and two in vitro unscheduled DNA synthesis assays; in vivo positive findings were found in open literature on chromosome aberration and on DNA damage caused through oxidative stress or by topoisomerase II inhibition, which is considered a molecular initiating event for infant leukaemia. Consequently, health based reference values cannot be established for chlorpyrifos and the dietary and non-dietary risk assessments cannot be conducted. •Developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) effects were observed in the available study on developmental neurotoxicity in rats (adverse effects were seen at the lowest dose tested in rats and a no observed adverse effects level 'NOAEL' could not be established) and epidemiological evidence exists showing an association between exposure to chlorpyrifos and/or chlorpyrifos-methyl during development and adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes in children. •Based on the evidence for DNT, experts during the peer review suggested that classification of chlorpyrifos as toxic for reproduction, category 1B, H360D 'May damage the unborn child', in accordance with the criteria set out in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 would be appropriate. For all these reasons, it is considered that a re-evaluation for toxicology and	1982 (T), 1995 (R), 1999 (T), 2000 (R), 2004 (R), 2006 (R)	0-0.01	0.1	On 4 April 2022, Adama advised withdrawal of support for periodic review of chlorpyrifos. Potential task-force partners maintain an interest in supporting the review but have not yet come forward to identify support.
	Requested to move to 2023	Permethrin (120)	Permethrin (120)	FMC and collaborators	Not supported. May 2020 update: FMC seeking collaborators-request deferral to 2023. Support confirmed 2 April 2022.	Not supported by manufacturer. Last reviewed over 25 years ago. May 2020 update: FMC seeking collaborators-request deferral to 2023.	1987	0.05, 1999	NR - 1999	On 2 April 2022, FMC confirmed preparedness for periodic review of permethrin in 2023.
	2023	Carbosulfan (145)/Carbofuran (96)	Carbosulfan (145)/Carbofuran (96)	FMC	Awaiting advice on supported commodities - ASPARAGUS; EGG PLANT, MANGO (Thailand). Support confirmed 2 April 2022.	Netherlands – public health concerns:¶Carbosulfan: Not approved (September 2007, RMS BE) - Information insufficient with regard to consumer exposure¶Concerns identified with regard to toxicity of the substance and presence of unknown levels of carcinogenic impurities which may increase during storage, Consumers exposure inconclusive due to uncertainties regarding the effects of certain metabolites, some of which could be genotoxic¶Carbofuran: Not approved (September 2007, RMS BE) - Information insufficient with regard to consumer exposure.¶Concerns identified - High toxicity of the substance and some of its metabolites, Consumer exposure inconclusive¶Deferred to JMPR 2020 due to workload. In May 2020, deferred to JMPR 2023 to conduct additional residue trials and tox studies.	1997	0.01, 1986/0.001, 1996	0.02, 2003 / 0.001, 2009	On 2 April 2022, FMC confirmed preparedness for periodic review of carbosulfan/carbofuran in 2023.
	2023	Parathion-methyl (059)	Parathion-methyl (059)	FMC-No longer supported	Unsupported	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1994R, 1995T	0.003, 1995	0.03, 1995	
<b>POTENTIAL REPLACEMENTS/RESERVES</b>										
RESERVE	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Chemtura/Lanxess?	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule, then brought to periodic review	1976, 1996T, 1998R	0.3, 1996	N/A		
RESERVE	Tebufenozide (196)	Tebufenozide (196)	Nippon Soda Co., Ltd	Orange, Citrus, Pome fruits, Grape (table and wine), Tomatoes, sweet peppers, bell peppers, aubergines/eggplants, maize/corn	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule, then brought to periodic review	1996, 2003T (ARFD)	0.02, 1996	0.9, 2003		

2024 AND BEYOND - NEW COMPOUND EVALUATIONS										
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA			COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ	FAO NOMINATION FORM RECEIVED?				
2024	30/11/2020	Proquinazid	Proquinazid	Yes	Yes	Yes	APPLES, CEREALS, GRAPES (TABLE & WINE), STRAWBERRIES	Apples (9), Grapes (table & wine, min 18 trials), Wheat/rye (18), Barley/oat (27), Strawberries (8)	USA/Corteva	Fungicide. Nomination received 30 November 2020. On 30 April 2022 manufacturer requested deferral to 2024.
2024	13/11/2019	XDE-747	XDE-747	No (Argentina by mid 2023)	Yes	Yes	Soybeans	Soybeans (12 trials, 6 Brazil + 6 Argentina)	Corteva AgriSciences/Argentina	Fungicide for 2023 schedule
2024	1/12/2020	Tiafenacil	Tiafenacil	Approval expected on Q2 2023	Yes	No	Corn (Subgroup 20E, 20F), Wheat (20A), Barley (20B), Cotton, Grape, Tree nuts (022), Citrus (001), Pome fruit (002), Stone fruit (003), Pulses (15A, Dry Pea, Dry Beans, Soybean) Oilseed Rape (023A)	Corn (31), Cotton (18), Grape (15), Soybean (21), Wheat (53), Barley (18), Dry pea (9), Dry Bean (13), Citrus (23), Tree nuts (10), Oilseed Rape (14), Pome fruit (17), Stone fruit (36)	USA / ISK Biosciences; Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha; Farm Hannong	Request nomination in JMPR 2024 after the registration in US in 2023.
2024		BAS 550 I	BAS 550 I	No (expected AUS Q4 2023)	Yes	No	Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits Leafy vegetables (including brassica leafy vegetables) Fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits Brassica vegetables Cotton	5 trials melon (BR), 6 trials rock melon (field) (AU), 4 cucumber (field crop) (AU), 4 zucchini (field crop) (AU), 6 Leafy Lettuce (AU), 4 spinach (AU), 4 chinese cabbage (AU), 5 trials tomato (BR), 6 trials tomato (AU), 6 trials capsicum (AU), 2 trials broccoli (AU), 2 trials cauliflower (AU), 6 trials cabbage (AU), 4 trials brussel sprouts (AU), 4 trials cotton (AU), 5 trials cotton seed (BR)	BASF SE	JMPR submission envisaged for Q4 2023
2024		Spidoxamat	Preliminary residue definition for enforcement: sum of Spidoxamat and Spidoxamat-cyclohydroxy (cis), expressed as Spidoxamat.	No (expected Q2 2023)	Yes	Yes	Soybean, Grapes, Pome fruits, Citrus, Stone fruits, Tree nuts	Soybean: 8 Trials, Grapes: 16 Trials + 2 proc, Pome fruits: 24 Trials + 2 proc, Citrus: 30 Trials + 2 proc, Stone fruits: 34 Trials + 2 proc, Tree nuts: 14 Trials	Bayer AG CropScience Division	Insecticide
2025	8/04/2022	Tetflupyrolimet	Tetflupyrolimet	No	Yes	Yes	Rice grain with hull; Rice straw; Rice hull	Rice grain with hull 918); Rice straw (18); Rice hull (3, processing)	USA/FMC	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2027	Nomination received 29/11/2019	XDE-481	XDE-481	No	Yes	Yes	Bananas	Bananas (12)	USA/Corteva	Fungicide for 2023 schedule. Delayed at request of Corteva on 16 February 2022 to be rescheduled to 2027.
<b>TOTAL FOR 2024=5</b>										
<b>TOTAL FOR 2025=1</b>										
<b>TOTAL FOR 2027=1</b>										

2024 AND BEYOND - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ	COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
2024	29/11/2019	NA	Flutriafol (248)	No	Yes	Potato, Sugarcane	Potato (12), Sugarcane (8)	USA/FMC	USA label is expected by 1Q2022. On 2 April 2022, FMC requested deferral to 2024, awaiting US registration of new uses at the end of 2023.
2024	4/09/2019	NA	Kresoxim-methyl (199)	Yes	Yes	POME FRUIT; Carrot (Morocco)		BASF	4 year rule CCPR51; Morocco proposed carrot
2024			Fluazaindolizine (999)	Yes	Yes	Citrus fruit, Stone Fruit, Grapes, Strawberry, Tree Nuts	Orange/Mandarin (16), Lemon (10), Grapefruit (7), Orange processing (3); Cherry (9), Peach (10), Plum (8), Plum processing (3); Grape (13), Grape processing (3); Strawberry (9); Almond (6), Pecan (6)	USA/Corteva	Requested by USA 01 December 2020; registration expected in US in Q2 2023.
2024	26/11/2020	NA	Trifloxystrobin (213)	Yes	Yes	AVOCADO, DRAGON FRUIT and MANGO	Avocado (4), Dragon fruit (4), Mango (4 trials)	Bayer AG	Australian label provided 26 November 2020. On 10 June 2021 company requested move to 2024.
2024	28/11/2017	NA	Fluopyram (243)	Yes	Yes	MELON, PINEAPPLE, PAPAYA, MINT, GINSENG, POMEGRANATE, GUAVA, AVOCADO, DRAGON FRUIT	Melon (16), pineapple (10), papaya (4), avocado (4), dragon fruit (4)	Bayer AG	Moved from 2020 to 2022 on request; Morocco proposed carrot; Bayer requested to move coffee to May 2021; Bayer requested to move cereals from 2020 to 2022; Bayer added avocado 26 November 2020; On 10 June 2021 company requested move of all commodities except cereals and carrots to 2024.
2024	8/04/2022	NA	Pyriproxyfen (200)	Yes	Yes	010 BRASSICA EXCEPT LEAFY VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 014 LEGUME VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 009 BULB VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 002 POME FRUITS CROP GROUP; 003 STONE FRUITS CROP GROUP; 004 BERRIES AND OTHER SMALL FRUITS CROP GROUP EXCEPT GRAPE; GRAPE; MUSTARD GREENS; CELERY	Cabbage (7), Cauliflower (6), Mustard green & stem (6); Snap beans (8), Peas (4); Onion (9); Apple (12), Pear (6); Sour cherries & sweet cherries (each 6), peach (9), Plum (7); Strawberry (8), Blueberries (5), Kiwi fruit (3); Grapes (8); Mustard green (6); Celery (6)	USA/Valent	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2024	8/04/2022	NA	Etoxazole (241)	Yes	Yes	002 POME FRUITS; CHERRY (SWEET & TART); PEACH (& NECTARINE); PLUM (& APRICOT); 004E LOW GROWING BERRIES, SUBGROUP 004D; 004A CANE BERRIES, SUBGROUP 004A; CORN, FIELD, GRAIN; CORN, POP, GRAIN; CORN, SWEET, FORAGE; CORN, SWEET, STOVER; AVOCADO	Apple (8), Pear (8), Cherries (8), Peach (8), Plum (6); Strawberries (8), Cranberries (8); Raspberries, blackberries (6); Field (& pop) corn (20); Field (& pop) corn (20); Sweet corn (forage) (8); Sweet corn (stover) (8); Avocado (5)	USA/Valent	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2024	8/04/2022	NA	Indoxacarb (216)	No (Yes for welsh onion)	Yes	Coffee, Sunflower Subgroup 004E, low growing berries, FB 009 (represented by Strawberry) Subgroup 010A, flowerhead brassicas, VB 0042 (represented by broccoli) Cabbage, head, WELSH ONION (ROK), RICE (Thailand)	Coffee (11), Sunflower (10), Strawberry (10), Broccoli (11), Cabbage, head (10), Welsh onion (6+2 processing), Rice (6)	USA/FMC, ROK (Welsh onion)	Advised by US on 8 April 2022. ROK advised on 27 April of ROK nomination. Rice commodity added in CRD 21 CCPR53 by Thailand.
2024	8/04/2022	NA	Fluindapyr	No	Yes	Soybeans, Grapes, Pome fruits, Stone fruits, Coffee, Cottonseed, Potato, Sugar beet	Soybeans (21), Grapes (16), Apple (13), Pear (6), Peach (9), Cherry (6), Plum (6), Coffee (17), Cottonseed (12), Potato (17), Sugar beet (12)	USA/FMC	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2024	8/04/2022	NA	Cyantraniliprole (263)	No	Yes	Hops, Papaya, Basil, Mint, Dill	Hops (6), Papaya (5), Basil (6), Mint (5), Dill (6)	USA/FMC	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2024		NA	Fosetyl-AI (302)	No	Yes	mango	Mango (7 trials)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022.
2024		NA	Isotianil (999)	No	Yes	mango	Mango (4 trials)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022.
2024		NA	Tebuconazole (189)	No	Yes	guava, pomegranade	Guava (4 trials), Pomegranade (4 trials)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022.
2024	27/04/2022	NA	Thiamethoxam (245)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+2 processing)	ROK	Nominated by ROK to eWG portal on 27 April 2022.
2024	27/04/2022	NA	Boscalid (221)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+2 processing)	ROK	Nominated by ROK to eWG portal on 27 April 2022.
2024		NA	Spinetoram (233)	Expected by 2023	Yes	Asparagus	Asparagus (7)	Corteva	Nominated by Corteva to eWG portal on 28 April 2022.
2024		NA	Sulfaxaflor (252)	Expected by 2023	Yes	Hops, Passion fruit, Kiwi, Blueberry	Hops (4 trials), Passion fruit (5 trials), Kiwi (6 trials), Blueberry (12 trials)	Corteva	Nominated by Corteva to eWG portal on 28 April 2022.
2025	25/11/2021	NA	XDE-659 (floripicoxamid) (999)	Yes	Yes	CHERRY, PEACH, PLUM, AVOCADO, TREE NUT, CAULIFLOWER, CABBAGE, BROCCOLI, TEA, CARROT, ONION, COTTON, POTATO, CITRUS	Cherry (15), Peach (12), Plum (8), Avocado (8), tree nut (10), cauliflower (12), cabbage (12), broccoli (12), tea (8), carrot (17), Coffee (8), Onion (24), Citrus (16), Cotton (8), Potato (29)	Corteva / USA	Fungicide for 2023 schedule; Crops in red to be postponed to JMPR 2025 review of New Uses, barley has been added now to the list for 2023 review. Advised 25 November 2021.
2025		NA	Flupyradifurone (285)	No	Yes	tea	Tea (8 + 2 processing)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022.
2025		NA	Glyphosate (158)	No	Yes	Coffee	Coffee (10 + 2 processing)	Bayer AG	On 25 April 2022, manufacturer requested move to 2025.
2026		NA	Fluazaindolizine (999)	No	Yes	Black pepper corns, Coffee beans, Sugarcane, Maize/Millet/Sorghum grain, Soybean seed, Cottonseed	Black pepper (4 trials), coffee (4 trials), sugarcane (4 trials), sugarcane processing (2 trials), maize (7 trials), soybean (6 trials), cottonseed (7 trials)	Corteva	Nominated by Corteva to eWG portal on 28 April 2022.
									Corteva comments: Residues of parent in cereal grains of rotational crops are <0.01 mg/kg. If the JMPR 2022 recommends an MRL in cereal grains as rotational crops, there is no need to submit specifically from Brazil and these could be removed.
									Corteva comments: Soybeans and cottonseed might be covered by the Codex MRL in oilseeds which is proposed = 1.5 mg/kg. If JMPR 2022 recommends MRL, there is no need to submit specifically from Brazil and these can be removed.
TOTAL FOR 2024=17									
TOTAL FOR 2025=3									
TOTAL FOR 2026=1									

TABLE 2A: PRIORITY LISTS OF PERIODIC REVIEWS – 2024-2025

Note 1: NR denotes "following evaluation, JMPR has deemed the establishment of an ARFD unnecessary"

Note 2: N/A denotes "not assessed – JMPR has not had the opportunity to consider, or determine the need for, an ARFD"

YEAR	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMODITIES	COMMENTS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	
2023	Chlorpyrifos (17)	Chlorpyrifos (17)	Advised 30 May 2020 that Corteva was not providing further support. 30 March 2021 Adama has indicated they will lead a submission and request deferral to 2023.	Adama to advise on supported commodities.	Chlorpyrifos was originally evaluated by JMPR in 1972. It was evaluated for toxicology in 1982 by JMPR and for residues in 1995 and it was reviewed for toxicology in 1999 (confirmed ADI of 0-0.01 mg/kg bw and ARFD 0.1 mg/kg bw) and for residues in 2000, 2004 and 2006. There is a 20 years' gap since chlorpyrifos was last reviewed by JMPR, as it is also indicated in General considerations (point 2.6) of 2019 Report of the extra Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues. During the 2019 EU Peer Review of the active substance, and based on the information available from the European Food Safety Authority's Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment of the active substance chlorpyrifos, concerns were identified with regard to: •The genotoxic potential of chlorpyrifos which cannot be ruled out based on the information available: positive findings were found in an in vitro chromosome aberration study and two in vitro unscheduled DNA synthesis assays; in vivo positive findings were found in open literature on chromosome aberration and on DNA damage caused through oxidative stress or by topoisomerase II inhibition, which is considered a molecular initiating event for infant leukaemia. Consequently, health based reference values cannot be established for chlorpyrifos and the dietary and non-dietary risk assessments cannot be conducted. •Developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) effects were observed in the available study on developmental neurotoxicity in rats (adverse effects were seen at the lowest dose tested in rats and a no observed adverse effects level 'NOAEL' could not be established) and epidemiological evidence exists showing an association between exposure to chlorpyrifos and/or chlorpyrifos-methyl during development and adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes in children. •Based on the evidence for DNT, experts during the peer review suggested that classification of chlorpyrifos as toxic for reproduction, category 1B, H360D 'May damage the unborn child', in accordance with the criteria set out in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 would be appropriate. For all these reasons, it is considered that a re-evaluation for toxicology and residues of chlorpyrifos and all their CXLs is necessary and this task should be prioritized on the JMPR calendar. It was noted that aspects of epidemiology should be included. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2019. Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment in the context of the pesticides peer review of the active substance chlorpyrifos. EFSA Journal 2019;17(5):5809 DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5809 <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5809">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5809</a>	1982 (T), 1995 (R), 1999 (T), 2000 (R), 2004 (R), 2006 (R)	0-0.01	0.1	Reinstated for 2023 following decision of CCRP53 on support from AgroCare
2024	Chlorpyrifos-methyl (90)	Chlorpyrifos-methyl (90)	Advised 30 May 2020 that Corteva was not providing further support	Not supported.	Moved to 2023 to align with chlorpyrifos.	1975, 2009	0-0.01, 2009	0.1, 2009	Decision of CCRP53 to retain CXLs pending periodic review in 2024.
Requested to move to 2023	Permethrin (120)	Permethrin (120)	FMC and collaborators	Not supported. May 2020 update: FMC seeking collaborators request deferral to 2023.	Not supported by manufacturer. Last reviewed over 25 years ago. May 2020 update: FMC seeking collaborators request deferral to 2023.	1987	0.05, 1999	NR – 1999	
2023	Carbosulfan (145)/Carbofuran (96)	Carbosulfan (145)/Carbofuran (96)	FMC	Awaiting advice on supported commodities – ASPARAGUS; EGG PLANT; MANGO (Thailand)	Netherlands – public health concerns for Carbosulfan: Not approved (September 2007, RMS-BE) – Information insufficient with regard to consumer exposure. Concerns identified with regard to toxicity of the substance and presence of unknown levels of carcinogenic impurities which may increase during storage. Consumers exposure inconclusive due to uncertainties regarding the effects of certain metabolites, some of which could be genotoxic. Carbofuran: Not approved (September 2007, RMS-BE) – Information insufficient with regard to consumer exposure. Concerns identified – High toxicity of the substance and some of its metabolites; Consumer exposure inconclusive. Deferred to JMPR 2020 due to workload. In May 2020, deferred to JMPR 2023 to conduct additional residue trials and tox studies.	1997	0.01, 1986/ 0.001, 1996	0.02, 2003/ 0.001, 2009	
2023	Parathion-methyl (059)	Parathion-methyl (059)	Chemnova	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1994R, 1995T	0.003, 1995	0.03, 1995	
2023	Piperonyl butoxide (062)	Piperonyl butoxide (062)	Endura	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule. Moved back to Table 2B based on 15 years since tox review and JMPR advice.	1995T, 2001T (ARFD), 2001R	0.2, 1995	NR	
2023 RESERVE	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Chemtura/Lanxess?	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1976, 1996T, 1998R	0.3, 1996	N/A	
2023 RESERVE	Tebufenozide (196)	Tebufenozide (196)	Nippon Soda Co., Ltd	Orange, Citrus, Pome fruits, Grape (table and wine), Tomatoes, sweet peppers, bell peppers, aubergines/eggplants, maize/corn	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1996, 2003T (ARFD)	0.02, 1996	0.9, 2003	
2024	Captan (07)	Captan (07)	Adama / UPL (co-sponsors)	Tree nuts, berries and other small fruits (blueberries, currants, gooseberries, raspberries, blackberries, dewberries, loganberries), strawberries, grapes, stone fruits (apricot, cherries, peach, nectarine, plums), pome fruits, citrus fruits, persimmon, potato, carrots, cucurbits edible peel, cucurbits inedible peel, chili peppers, sweet peppers, tomatoes, eggplant, bulb onion, garlic, maize, cotton, cereal grains, rice, rapeseed, soybean, root and rhizome spices	Moved from Table 3 to Table 2A under 25 year rule. Existing CXLs plus additional global uses/MRLs proposed. Periodic re-evaluation with additional supporting residues trials data for new commodities and updated data where available. An update on the number of studies can be provided in due course. Update provided by sponsor 27112020.	1963, 1995T, 2000R, 2007T (ARFD)	0-0.1, 1995	0.3, 2007	



2024	Folpet (041)	Folpet (041)	Adama	Pome fruit, grapes, strawberry, avocado, tomato, eggplant, cucurbits edible peel, cucurbits inedible peel, head lettuce, bulb onion, shallot, garlic, potato, radishes, cereal grains, hops	Moved from Table 3 to Table 2A under 25 year rule. Existing CXLs plus additional global uses/MRLs proposed. Periodic re-evaluation with additional supporting residues trials data for new commodities and updated data where available. An update on the number of studies can be provided in due course. Update provided by sponsor 27112020.	1969, 1995T, 1998R, 2007T (ARFD)	0-0.1, 1995	0.2, 2004
2024	Disulfoton (74)	Disulfoton (74)	No longer supported by the manufacturer	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1973, 1996 (ARFD)	0.003, 2006	0.003 - 2006
2024	Pirimiphos-methyl (86)	Pirimiphos-methyl (86)	Syngenta	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1974, 1992T, 2006T(AR/D), 2003R	0.03, 2006	0.2, 2006
2024	Flumethrin (195)	Flumethrin (195)	Bayer CropScience; sent to JECFA 2019	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 3 to Table 2A under 25 year rule.	1996	0.004, 1996	NR
2025	2,4-D (020)	2,4-D (020)	Industry Task Force II on 2,4-D Research Data	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	Moved from Table 2B to Table 2A under 25 year rule. On 26 February 2022, Sponsor requested to delay to 2025 to enable more time to coordinate data compilation across registrants and to alleviate JMPRs workload.	1996T, 1998R, 2001T (ARFD)	0.01, 1996	NR
2025 (moved from 2022 on request of FMC); On 2 April 2022, FMC requested deferral to 2025.		Malathion (49)	FMC/USA	Awaiting advice on supported commodities.	October 2020-FMC requested deferral to 2023, awaiting reviews in US and Europe in 2022. On 2 April 2022, FMC requested postponement of periodic review of malathion, pending 2024 review in EU and 2024/25 review in US. In 2023, FMC is developing new residue data to support these reviews. JMPR confirmed that tox was reviewed in 2016, but residues last full review was 1999.	1965, 1997T, 2003T (ARFD), 1999R	0.3, 1997	2.0, 2003
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPR52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	Pirimicarb (101)	Pirimicarb (101)	Syngenta & Collaborators	Supported by the manufacturer -Nov18. Collaborators needed for residue data package. Public health concerns - acute dietary risk- Netherlands - check uses for peach and lettuce based on existing residue data and labels. Moved from 2017 New use and other evaluations.	Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCPR52 in 2021.	2004T, 2006R	0.02, 2006	0.1, 2006
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPR52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	Hydrogen phosphide, (zinc and aluminium salts) (46)	Hydrogen phosphide (46)	Degesch	Cereal grains, citrus, almonds	Additional preparation time requested. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCPR52 in 2021.	1971	NR	N/A
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPR52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	Clethodim (187)	Clethodim (187)	UPL	Crops reviewed by JMPR in 2019: Artichoke, globe, broccoli, cabbage, head, carrot, VD 0071 Beans, dry, VP 0061 Beans, except broad bean and soya bean, AL 0061 Bean fodder, Bean, forage, VD 0561 Field pea (dry), Pea, fodder, Pea, vining, Hops, dry SO 0495, Rape seed, OC 0495 Rape seed oil, Crude OR 0495 Rape seed oil, Edible, VA 0381 Garlic, VA 0385 Onions, bulb, Strawberries Crops with CXLs withdrawn and not reviewed by JMPR in 2019: AL 1020 Alfalfa fodder, VD 0541 Soya bean (dry), OC 0541 Soya bean oil, crude, OR 0541 Soya bean oil, refine, VR 0596 Sugar beet, SO 0702 Sunflower seed, OC 0702 Sunflower seed oil, crude, VO 0448 Tomato, AM 1051 Fodder beet, SO 0697 Peanut, VR 0589 Potato, SO 0691 Cotton seed, OC 0691 Cotton seed oil, Crude, OR 0691 Cotton seed oil, Edible, MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian), PE 0112 Eggs, MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine animals), ML 0105 Milks, PM 0110 Poultry meat, PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	JMPR review in 2019. Additional data generated to address identified gaps. 22062021 company requested commencement of 4 year rule. If agreed, term should commence 2021 and expire 2025. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCPR52 in 2021.	1999T(ARFD), 2019T, R		
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPR52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	Guazatine (114)	Guazatine (114)	ICA (Adama)	Supported by the manufacturer	Guazatine appears to be a special case. In 1978 an ADI was derived, which was withdrawn in 1997 since "The Meeting concluded that it could not establish an ADI for guazatine owing to the inadequate information on its composition and concerns about the production of rare malignant tumours in mice". "The Meeting estimated the maximum residue level shown in Annex I.As the Meeting withdrew the ADI for guazatine this is recorded only as a Guideline Level". As such no CXLs are supposed to be available. However, a CXL for cereal grains (0.05* mg/kg G = guideline value) and citrus fruit (5 mg/kg Po = post harvest use) can still be found in the Codex Alimentarius. ¶Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the JMPR 1997 evaluation, show that the CXL for Citrus fruits of 5 mg/kg Po is withdrawn, but that for cereals a maximum residue level of 0.05* mg/kg is proposed. The CXL of 5 mg/kg has been adopted by the CCPR in 1999. It is unclear which discussion is behind this. The problem is that this specific MRL-crop combination gives rise to a human health risk. Only "guideline levels" (5 mg/kg) for citrus exist since the ADI was withdrawn in 1997. It was recommended that these guideline levels would remain until a new ADI is recommended. It is proposed either to delete the guideline level or request sponsors to support a re-evaluation of guazatine. There are no CXLs in place in CX/PR 14/46/5 - instead guideline levels are set - clarification from Codex Secretariat is sought. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCPR52 in 2021. Advised by JMPR on 9 February 2022 that a data package had been delivered to JMPR; assessed as inadequate basis on which to estimate health based guidance values.	1997TR	1997 / Withdrawn	N/A

**TABLE 2B: PERIODIC REVIEW LIST (COMPOUNDS LISTED UNDER 15 YEAR RULE BUT NOT YET SCHEDULED OR LISTED)**

Compounds listed in this table have not been evaluated for at least 15 years. Decisions on the prioritization of these compounds should be based on the relevant criteria specified in pp159-161 of the Codex Procedural Manual. Compounds are listed in Table 2b awaiting advice on supporting data packages and/or an indication of manufacturer/member country support. ¶

CODE	COMPOUND	CURRENT NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	MANUFACTURER	COMMENT
8	Carbaryl	Yes	1965, 2001T(ADI, ARFD), 2002R	0.008, 2001	0.2, 2001	Bayer CropScience	No longer supported by the manufacturer
30	Diphenylamine	Yes	1998T, 2001R	0.08, 1998	NR, 1998	Cerex Agri	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
56	2-phenylphenol	Yes	1999	0.4, 1999	NR 1999		manufacturer unknown
62	Piperonyl butoxide	Yes	1995T, 2001T (ARFD), 2001R	0.2, 1995	NR	Endura S.p.A and Task Force II	Awaiting advice on supported commodities. Moved back to Table 2B under 15 year rule.
63	Pyrethrins	Yes	1965, 2000R, 2003T	0-0.04, 1972, confirmed 1999, 2005	0.2, 1999	No manufacturer	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
79	Amitrole	Yes	1997T, 1998R	0.002, 1997	N/A	Nufarm	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
84	Dodine		1974, 2000T, 2003R	0.1, 2000	0.2, 2000	Nufarm	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
87	Dinocap	Yes	1969, 1998T, 2000T(ARFD)	0.008, 1998	0.008 (WCBA), 0.03 (general), 2000		No longer supported by the manufacturer
94, 154	Methomyl / thiodicarb	Yes	2001TR, 2004R	0.02, 2001	0.02, 2001	Corteva	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
100	Methamidophos		1976, 2002T, 2003R	0-0.004, 2002	0.01, 2002		No longer supported by the manufacturer
103	Phosmet		1976, 1994T, 2003T, 1997R, 2002R	0.01, 1998	0.2, 2003	Gowan	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
113	Propargite	Yes	1977, 1999T, 2002R	0.01, 1999	NR, 1999, confirmed 2006	Chemtura	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
135	Deltamethrin	Yes	1980, 2000T, 2002R	0-0.01, 1982, confirmed 2000	0.05, 2000	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
144	Bitertanol	Yes	1983, 1998T, 1999R	0.01, 1988, confirmed 1998	NR 1998		No longer supported by the manufacturer
166	Oxydemeton-methyl		1989, 2002T, 1998R	0-0.0003, 2004	0.002, 2002	United Phosphorous	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
167	Terbufos		1989, 2003T	0-0.0006, 1989	0.002, 2003	AMVAC	No longer supported by the manufacturer
197	Fenbuconazole	Yes	1997TR, 2009, 2012, 2013R	0-0.03, 1997	0.2, 2012	Corteva	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
200	Pyriproxyfen	Yes	1999T, 2000R, 2001T	0-0.1, 1999	NR, 1999	Sumitomo Chemical / Valent Canada	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
203	Spinosad	Yes	2001T, (2004, 2008, 2011)R	0-0.02, 2001	NR, 2001	Corteva	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
204	Esfenvalerate	Yes	2002TR	0-0.02, 2002	0.02, 2002	Sumitomo	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
205	Flutolanil	Yes	2002TR, 2013R	0.09, 2002	NR, 2002	Nihon Nohyaku	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
206	Imidacloprid	Yes	2001T, (2002,06,08,12,15,17)R	0-0.06, 2001	0.4, 2002, confirmed 2006	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
207	Cyprodinil	Yes	2003TR, (2013, 2015, 2017)R	0-0.03, 2003	NR, 2003	Syngenta	pulses subgroups VD 2065 2066 (new uses)
208	Famoxadone	Yes	2003TR	0-0.006, 2003	0.6, 2003	Corteva	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
209	Methoxyfenozide	Yes	2003T, (2003, 2006, 2009, 2012)R	0-0.1, 2003	0.9, 2003	Corteva	Basil (new uses)
210	Pyraclostrobin	Yes	2003T, (2004,2006, 2011, 2012, 2014)R	0-0.03, 2003	0.7, 2018	BASF	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
211	Fludioxonil	Yes	2004	0-0.04, 2004	NR, 2004	Syngenta	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
213	Trifloxystrobin	Yes	2004	0-0.04, 2004	NR, 2004	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
214	Dimethanid-P		2005	0-0.07, 2005	0.5, 2005	BASF	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
215	Fenhexamid		2005	0-0.2, 2005	NR, 2005	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
216	Indoxacarb		2005	0-0.01, 2005	0.1, 2005	FMC	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
217	Novaluron		2005	0-0.01, 2005	NR, 2005	Adama	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
218	Sulfuryl fluoride		2005	0-0.01, 2005	0.3, 2005	Douglas Company	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
67	Cyhexatin		1970, 2005T, 2005R	0.007, 2005	NA	Cerex Agri	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
95	Acephate		1976, 2005T, 2003R	0-0.03, 2005	0.1, 2005	Arysta Life Science	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
112	Phorate		1977, 2004T, 2005R	0-0.0007, 2004	0.003, 2004	BASF / AMVAC	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
129	Azocyclotin		1979, 2005T, 2005R	0-0.003, 1994, 2005	0.02, 2005	Cerex Agri	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
132	Methiocarb		1981, 1998T, 1999R, 2005R (ARFD)	0-0.02, 1998, 2005	0.02, 2005	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
147	Methoprene		1984, 2001T, 2005R	0.09 (R,S racemate) & 0.05 (S-methoprene), 2005	NR, 2005	Syngenta?	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
149	Ethoprophos		1983, 1999T, 2004R	0-0.0004, 1999	0.05, 1999	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
151	Dimethipin		1985, 1999T, 2004T(ARFD), 2001R	0-0.02, 1998, confirmed 1999, 2004	0.2, 2004	Chemtura	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
158	Glyphosate		1986, 2004	0-1, 2011	NR, 2011	Bayer Crop Science (Monsanto)	Awaiting advice on supported commodities
195	Flumethrin		1996	0.004, 1996	NA	Bayer CropScience; sent to JECFA 2019	Awaiting advice on supported commodities

At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for citrus fruit CXLs

Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021

160	Propiconazole		1987, 2004T, 2007R	0-0.07, 2004	0.3, 2004	Syngenta	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
17	Chlorpyrifos		1972, 1999T, 2000R, 2006 (ARfD)	0-0.01, 1982, confirmed 1999	0.1, 2006	Adama	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
201	Chlorpropham		2000, 2005T (ADI, ARfD)	0-0.05, 2005	0.5, 2005	Cerex Agri	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
32	Endosulfan		1965, 1998T, 2006R	0.006, 1998	0.02, 1998	Adama	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
133/168	Triadimefon/triadimenol		1979, 2004T, 2007R	0-0.03, 1985/1989, 2004	0.08, 2004	133 /168 - Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
143	Triazophos		1982, 2002T, 2007R	0-0.001, 2002	0.001, 2002	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
148	Propamocarb		1984, 2005T, 2006R	0-0.4, 2005	2, 2005	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
155	Benalaxyl		1986, 2005T, 2009R	0-0.07, 2005, confirmed 2009	0.1, 2009	FMC	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
156	Clofentezine		1986, 2005T, 2007R	0-0.02, 1986, confirmed 2005	NR, 2005	Adama	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 1 March 2021
194	Haloxyfop		1995, 2006T, 2009R	0-0.0007, 2006	0.08, 2009	Dow AgroSciences	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
188	Fenpropimorph		1994, 2004T (ARfD), 2017	0-0.0004, 2017	0.1 (WCBA), 0.4 (general), 2017	BASF	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
157	Cyfluthrin		1986, 2006T, 2007R	0-0.04, 2006	0.04, 2006, 2009	Adama / Bayer	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
219	Bifenazate		2006	0-0.01, 2006	NR, 2006	Chemtura	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
222	Quinoxifen		2006	0-0.02, 2006	NR, 2006	Dow AgroSciences	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
223	Thiacloprid		2006	0-0.01, 2006	0.03, 2006	Bayer CropScience	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
85	Fenamiphos		1974, 997T, 1999R, 2006T (ARfD)	0-0.0008, 1997, confirmed 2006	0.003, 2002, confirmed 2006	Adama	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
118	Cypermethrin		1979, 2006T, 2008R	0-0.02, 2006	0.04, 2006, 2009	FMC / AgriPhar	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022
169	Cyromazine		1990, 2006T, 2007R	0-0.06, 2006	0.1, 2006	Syngenta	Awaiting advice on supported commodities	Copied from Table 3 to 2B on 5 January 2022

TABLE 3: RECORD OF REVIEW						
CODE	COMPOUND	INITIAL JMPR EVALUATION	PERIODIC REVIEWS	SCHEDULED TOX REVIEW	SCHEDULED RESIDUE REVIEW	MANUFACTURER/COMMENT
8	Carbaryl	1965	2001T(ADI, ARfD), 2002R	2019	2019	Bayer CropScience
27	Dimethoate	1965	1996T, 2003T(ARfD), 1998R, 2019T, R,	2019/2021/2022	2019/2021	
96	Carbofuran	1976	1996T, 2008T(ARfD), 1997R, 2019 (postponed due to insufficient information)	2019	2019	FMC
145	Carbosulfan	1984	2003T, 1997R, 2019 (postponed due to insufficient information)	2023	2023	FMC
187	Clethodim	1994	1999T(ARfD), 2019T, R	2025	2025	Support from USA, UPL
191	Tolclofos-methyl	1994	2019T, R	2019	2019	Sumitomo Chemical
22	Diazinon	1965	2006T, 1993	2020	2020	Adama
35	Ethoxyquin	1969	2005T, 1999R	2022	2021	Pace (Sumitomo Chemical Company)
51	Methidathion	1972	1997T, 1992	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022), from 2020	2020	Not supported
64	Quintozene	1969	1995	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022), from 2021	2021	Chemtura
117	Aldicarb	1979	1992T, 1995T(ARfD), 1994R	2021	2021	AgLogicChemcial LLC
138	Metaxyl	1982	2002T	2021	2021	Quimicas del Vallés - SCC GmbH
142	Prochloraz	1983	2001T, 2004R	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022), from 2021	2021	Bayer CropScience
202	Fipronil	2000/2001	None	2021	2021	BASF
212	Metaxyl-M	2002	None	2021	2021	Syngenta
46	Hydrogen phosphide	1965	1966T	2025	2025	Phosphine Producers Association
47	Bromide ion	1968	1988T	2021	2021	Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR pesticide list. Retained for spices.
101	Pirimicarb	1976	2004	2025	2025	Syngenta
105	Dithiocarbamates	1965	1993R/1996T ferbam/ziram, 2004 propineb	2022	2022	Includes - incl propineb, ferbam, ziram / individual DTCs are evaluated, propineb 2004, ferbam/ziram 1996
109	Fenbutatin oxide	1977	1992T, 1993R	2021	2021	Not supported by BASF
114	Guazatine	1977	1997	2025	2025	Guideline limits – citrus, pome fruit
120	Permethrin	1979	1999T	2023	2023	Not supported by BASF; FMC seeking collaborators
72	Carbendazim	1973	1995T, 2005T(ARfD), 1998R	2022	2022	Nippon Soda
111	Iprodione	1977	1995T, 1994R	2023	2023	Support from FMC
130	Diflubenzuron	1981	2001T, 2002R	JECFA comments		Chemtura
211	Fludioxonil	2004	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Syngenta

At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for various commodity CXLs

At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for all commodity CXLs

At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for various commodity CXLs

213	Trifloxystrobin	2004	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for citrus fruit CXLs
214	Dimethenamid-P	2005	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	BASF	
215	Fenhexamid	2005	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
216	Indoxacarb	2005	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	FMC	
217	Novaluron	2005	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Adama	
218	Sulfuryl fluoride	2005	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences	
219	Bifenazate	2006	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Chemtura	
220	Aminopyralid	2007	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Dow AgroSciences	
221	Boscalid	2006	2019T (ARfD)			BASF	
222	Quinoxifen	2006	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences	
223	Thiacloprid	2006	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
224	Difenoconazole	2007	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
225	Dimethomorph	2007	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF	
226	Pyrimethanil	2007	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
227	Zoxamide	2007	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Gowan	
229	Azoxystrobin	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
230	Chlorantraniliprole	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	FMC	
231	Mandipropamid	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
232	Prothioconazole	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
233	Spinetoram	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Dow AgroSciences	
234	Spirotetramat	2008	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
235	Fluopicolide	2009	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
236	Metaflumizone	2009	2019T (ARfD)	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF	
237	Spirodiclofen	2009	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
238	Clothianidin	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Sumitomo Chemical	
239	Cyproconazole	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
240	Dicamba	2010	2019T (ARfD)	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF	
241	Etoxazole	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Sumitomo Chemical	
242	Flubendiamide	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku	
243	Fluopyram	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
244	Meptyldinocap	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Dow AgroSciences	
245	Thiamethoxam	2010	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
246	Acetamiprid	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nippon Soda	
247	Emamectin-benzoate	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
248	Flutriafol	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Cheminova	
249	Isopyrazam	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
250	Propylene oxide	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Aberco	
251	Saflufenacil	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF	
252	Sulfoxaflor	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Dow AgroSciences	
253	Penthiopyrad	2011	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	DuPont	
253	Ametoctradin	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[BASF] – USA	
254	Chlorfenapyr	2018 R, 2012T	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[BASF] – Brazil	
255	Dinotefuran	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[Mitsui Chemicals Agro] – Japan	
256	Fluxapyroxad	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[BASF] – USA	
257	MCPA	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[Nufarm] – USA	
258	Picoxystrobin	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[Dupont] -USA	
259	Sedaxane	2012	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	[Syngenta] – USA	

261	Benzovindiflupyr	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
262	Bixafen	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience
263	Cyantraniliprole	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	FMC
264	Fenamidone	2013/14	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience
265	Fluensulfone	2013/14	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Adama
266	Imazapic	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
267	Imazapyr	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
268	Isoxaflutole	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience
269	Tolfenpyrad	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku
270	Triflumizole	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nippon Soda
271	Trinexapac ethyl	2013	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
272	Aminocyclopyrachlor	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	DuPont
273	Cyflumetofen	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
274	Dichlobenil	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Chemtura
275	Flufenoxuron	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
276	Imazamox	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
277	Mesotrione	2014	2019T (ARfD)	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
278	Metrafenone	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
279	Pymetrozine	2014	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
280	Acetochlor	2015	2019T (ARfD)	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Monsanto
281	Cyazofamid	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha
282	Flonicamid	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha
283	Fluazifop-p-butyl	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
284	Flumioxazin	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Sumitomo
285	Flupyradifurone	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience
286	Lufenuron	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
287	Quinclorac	2015	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
288	Acibenzolar-S methyl	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
289	Imazethapyr	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
290	Isofetamid	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha
291	Oxathiapiprolin	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	DuPont
292	Pendimethalin	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF
293	Pinoxaden	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
294	Spiromesifen	2016	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience
295	Bicyclopyrone	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta
296	Cyclaniliprole	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha
297	Fenazaquin	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Gowan
298	Fenpyrazamine	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Sumitomo chemical
299	Isoprothiolane	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku
300	Natamycin	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	DSM Food Specialities
301	Phosphonic acid	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nufarm / Bayer CropScience
302	Fosetyl Al	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nufarm / Bayer CropScience
303	Triflumezopyrim	2017	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	DuPont
20	2,4-D	1970	1996T, 1998R, 2001T(ARfD)	2016	Table 2A	Dow AgroSciences
30	Diphenylamine	1969	1998T, 2001R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Cerex Agri
39	Fenthion	1971	1995, 1997T(ARfD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Not supported by manufacturer
49	Malathion	1965	1997T, 2003T(ARfD), 1999R, 2016T	Table 2A	Table 2A	FMC
56	2-phenylphenol	1969	1999	Table 2B	Table 2B	No manufacturer

59	Parathion-methyl	1965	1995T, 2000R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Cheminova
62	Piperonyl butoxide	1965	1995T, 2001T(ARfD), 2001R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Endura
63	Pyrethrins	1965	2000R, 2003T	Table 2B	Table 2B	No manufacturer
74	Disulfoton	1973	1996T(ARfD)	Table 2A	Table 2A	Bayer CropScience
79	Amitrole	1974	1997T, 1998R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Nufarm
84	Dodine	1974	2000T, 2003R	Table 2B	Table 2B	AgriPhar SA
86	Pirimiphos-methyl	1974	1992T, 2006T(ARfD), 2003R	Table 2A	Table 2A	Syngenta
87	Dinocap	1969	1998T, 2000T(ARfD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Not supported by manufacturer
94	Methomyl	1975	2001	Table 2B	Table 2B	DuPont
100	Methamidophos	1976	2002T, 2003R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience
102	Maleic hydrazide	1976	1996T, 1998R	Table 2A	Table 2A	Chemtura
103	Phosmet	1976	1994T, 2003T, 1997R 2002R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Gowan
113	Propargite	1977	1999T, 2002R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Chemtura
135	Deltamethrin	1980	2000T, 2002R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience
144	Bitertanol	1983	1998T, 1999R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience
166	Oxydemeton-methyl	1989	2002T, 1998R	Table 2B	Table 2B	United Phosphorous
167	Terbufos	1989	2003T	Table 2B	Table 2B	AMVAC
196	Tebufozide	1996	2003T(ARfD)	Table 2A	Table 2A	Nippon Soda
197	Fenbuconazole	1997	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences
200	Pyriproxyfen	1999	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Sumitomo Chemical / Valent Canada
203	Spinosad	2001	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences
204	Esfenvalerate	2002	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Sumitomo Chemical
205	Flutolanil	2002	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Nihon Nohyaku
206	Imidacloprid	2001	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience
207	Cyprodinil	2003	2019T (ARfD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Syngenta
208	Famoxadone	2003	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	DuPont
209	Methoxyfenozide	2003	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences
210	Pyraclostrobin	2003	None	Table 2B	Table 2B	BASF
315	Pyridate	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Belchim Crop Protection
321	Pyrasulfotole	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer AG CropScience
2	Azinphos-methyl	1965	2007T			Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR pesticide list. Retained for spices.
7	Captan	1963	1995T, 2000R, 2007T (ARfD)	2024	2024	Arysta Life Science
15	Chlormequat	1970	1997T, 1999T (ARfD), 1994, 2017	2017	2017	Support from BASF
17	Chlorpyrifos	1972	1999T, 2000R, 2006T (ARfD)	2022	2022	Adama
25	Dichlorvos	1965	2011T, 2012R			AMVAC
26	Dicofol	1968	1992, 2011T			Not supported by manufacturer
31	Diquat	1970	1993T, 1994R, 2013			Syngenta
32	Endosulfan	1965	1998T, 2006R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Adama
37	Fenitrothion	1969	2003R, 2007T (ADI, ARfD)			Sumitomo
41	Folpet	1969	1995T, 1998R, 2007T (ARfD)	2024	2024	Adama
48	Lindane	1965	2002T, 2003R, 2015			EMRLs proposed
57	Paraquat	1970	2003T, 2004R, 2009 (ARfD)			Syngenta
60	Phosalone	1972	1997T, 2001T (ARfD), 1994R			Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR pesticide list. Retained for spices.
65	Thiabendazole	1970	1997T, 1997R, 2006T (ARfD), 2019T (ARfD)			Syngenta
67	Cyhexatin	1970	2005T, 2005R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Cerex Agri

70	Bromopropylate-	1973	1993			Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds-removed from the CCPR pesticide list	
81	Chlorothalonil	1974	2009T, 2010R, 2019T (ARfD)	2009/2010	2009/2010	Syngenta	
83	Dichloran-	1974	1977, 1998	Table 2B	Table 2B	Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds-removed from the CCPR pesticide list	
85	Fenamiphos	1974	1997T, 1999R, 2006T (ARfD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Adama	
90	Chlorpyrifos-methyl	1975	2009			Dow AgroSciences	
95	Acephate	1976	2005T, 2003R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Arysta Life Science	
106	Ethephon	1977	2002T (ARfD), 2015T	2015	2015	Bayer CropScience	
110	Imazalil	1977	1977, 2000T, 2005T (ARfD), 2018	2018	2018	Janssen	
112	Phorate	1977	2004T, 2005R	Table 2B	Table 2B	BASF / AMVAC	
116	Triforine	1977	1997T, 2014			Support from Sumitomo Co.	
118	Cypermethrin	1979	2006T, 2008R	Table 2B	Table 2B	FMC / AgriPhar	
119	Fenvalerate	1979	2012			Sumitomo Chemical	
122	Amitraz	1980	1998T			Arysta Lifesciences	
126	Oxamyl	1980	2002, 2017	2017	2017	Dupont	
129	Azocyclotin	1979	2005T, 2005R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Cerex Agri	
132	Methiocarb	1981	1998T, 1999R, 2005R (ARfD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
133	Triadimefon/triadimenol	1979	2004T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	133 /168 - Bayer CropScience	
143	Triazophos	1982	2002T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
146	Lambda-cyhalothrin	1984	2007T, 2008R			Syngenta	
147	Methoprene	1984	2001T, 2005R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences	
148	Propamocarb	1984	2005T, 2006R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
149	Ethoprophos	1983	1999T, 2004R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Bayer CropScience	
151	Dimethipin	1985	1999T, 2004T (ARfD), 2001R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Chemtura	
155	Benalaxyl	1986	2005T, 2009R	Table 2B	Table 2B	FMC	
156	Clofentezine	1986	2005T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Adama	
157	Cyfluthrin	1986	2006T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Adama / Bayer	
158	Glyphosate	1986	2004	Table 2B	Table 2B	Monsanto	
160	Propiconazole	1987	2004T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Syngenta	
165	Flusilazole	1989	2007			DuPont	
169	Cyromazine	1990	2006T, 2007R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Syngenta	
171	Profenofos	1990	2007T, 2008R			Syngenta	
172	Bentazone	1991	2012T, 2004T (ARfD), 2013			BASF	
173	Buprofezin	1991	2008, 2019T (aniline)			Nihon Nohyaku	
174	Cadusafos	1991	2009T, 2010R			FMC	
175	Glufosinate-ammonium	1991	2012			Bayer CropScience	
176	Hexythiazox	1991	2008T, 2009R			Nippon Soda Co., Ltd	
177	Abamectin	1992	1997T, 2015T	2015	2015	Syngenta	
178	Bifenthrin	1992	2009T, 2010R			FMC	At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for alternate GAP for lettuce head, retained at Step 4.
179	Cycloxydim	1992	2009T, 2012R			BASF	
180	Dithianon	1992	2010T, 2013R			BASF	
181	Myclobutanil	1992	2014			Support from Dow AgroSciences	
182	Penconazole	1992	2016			Syngenta	
184	Etofenprox	1993	2011T,R			Mitsui Chemical Inc	
185	Fenpropathrin	1993	2012T, 2014			Sumitomo Chemical	



188	Fenpropimorph	1994	2004T (ARFD), 2017	2017	2017	BASF	
189	Tebuconazole	1994	2010T, 2011R			Bayer CropScience	
190	Teflubenzuron	1994	2016			Support unknown	
192	Fenarimol	1995	None			Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR pesticide list	
193	Fenpyroximate	1995	2007T (ARFD), 2017	2017	2017	Nihon Nohyaku	At CCPR53 in 2022, 4 year rule extension agreed for various commodity CXLS
194	Haloxyfop	1995	2006T, 2009R	Table 2B	Table 2B	Dow AgroSciences	
195	Flumethrin	1996	None	Table 2A	Table 2A	Bayer CropScience; sent to JECFA 2019	
199	Kresoxim-methyl	1998	2018	2018	2018	BASF	
201	Chlorpropham	2000	2005T (ADI, ARFD)	Table 2B	Table 2B	Cerex Agri	
304	Ethiprole	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer CropScience	
305	Fenpicoxamid	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Dow AgroSciences	
306	Fluazinam	2022	None			ISK Biosciences / Isihara Sangyo Kaisha	
307	Mandestrobin	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Sumitomo Chemical	
308	Norflurazon	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Tessenderlo Kerley Inc.	
309	Pydiflumetofen	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
310	Pyriofenone	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	ISK Biosciences / Isihara Sangyo Kaisha	
311	Tioxazafen	2018	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Monsanto	
316	Pyrifluquinazon	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku	
313	Metconazole	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Valent USA / Kureha	
312	Afidopyropen	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Meiji SeikaPharma / BASF	
317	Triflumuron	2019, completed 2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer	
314	Pyflubumide	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku	
318	Valifenalate	2019	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Belchim Crop Protection	
319	Flutianil	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	OAT Agrio	
320	Mefentrifluconazole (BAS 750F)	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	BASF	
322	Pyraziflumid	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Nihon Nohyaku	
323	SYN546330 Spiropidion	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Syngenta	
324	Tetraniliprole	2021	None	Never scheduled	Never scheduled	Bayer AG CropScience	
999	Tricyclazole	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		Corteva AgriSciences	
999	Ethalfuralin	2022?	None			Gowan	
999	BCS-CN88460 Isoflucypram	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		Bayer CropScience	
999	Inpyrfluxam	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022 (from 2020)		Sumitomo chemical	
999	BCS-55621	2022?	None			Bayer CropScience	
999	Broflanilide	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		Landis International / Mitsui Chemicals	

999	Benzpyrimoxan	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		Nihon Nohyaku
999	Fluindapyr	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		FMC
999	Fluazaindolizine	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		DuPont
999	Isocycloseram (SYN54707, SYN407)	2022?	None			Syngenta
999	Fluoxapiprolin (BCS-CS55621)	2022?	None			Bayer
999	Acynonapyr	2022?	None			Japan/Nippon Soda Co Ltd
999	Isotianil	2022 (WHO has confirmed assessment in 2022)	None	2022		Bayer AG/Sumitomo Chemicals Company
999	1,4-dimethylnaphthalene (1,4-DMN)	2022?	None			1,4GROUP, Inc., 2307 E. Commercial St., Ste. A Meridian ID 83642 USA
999	Mepiquat chloride	2022?	None			Nisso/BASF
999	Proquinazid	2023?	None			USA/Corteva
999	Carfentrazone	2023?	None			USA/FMC
999	Cyclobutrifluram (SYN522)	2023?	None			Canada/Syngenta
999	Fenpropidin	2023?	None			Syngenta
999	Fluoxapiprolin (BCS-CS55621)	2023?	None			Bayer AG, Division Crop Science
999	Florpyricoxamid (XDE-659)	2023?	None			Corteva AgriSciences / USA
999	Florpyrauxifen-benzyl (XDE-848)	2023?	None			Corteva/USA
999	XDE-747	2024?	None			Corteva AgriSciences/Argentina
999	Tiafenacil	2024?	None			USA / ISK Biosciences; Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha; Farm Hannong
999	Tetflupyrolimet	2025	None			USA/FMC
999	XDE-481	2027	None			Corteva AgriSciences / USA

TABLE 2B: PERIODIC REVIEW LIST - NOT YET SCHEDULED (PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS LODGED FOR COMPOUNDS NOT LISTED UNDER 15 YEAR RULE)									
CODE	COMPOUND	CURRENT NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	MANUFACTURER	COMMENT	JMPR RESPONSE	
130	Diffubenzuron	Yes	2001 (T), 2002(R).	0-0.02	Unnecessary	Chemtura	Diffubenzuron was evaluated by JMPR in 1981 and reviewed in 2001 (T) and 2002(R). In its peer review in 2015, EFSA identified a new concern related to the potential exposure to the metabolite and impurity 4-chloroaniline (PCA). Given the genotoxic properties of PCA identified on the basis of the confirmatory information, and given the carcinogenic properties of PCA and the absence of a threshold for acceptable exposure, EFSA found that the potential toxicological relevance of PCA needs to be further investigated. JMPR did not receive any new data on 4-chloroaniline but was aware of the JECFA veterinary drugs meeting scheduled for October 2019 was reviewing diflubenzuron.		
160	Propiconazole	Yes	2004	0-0.07	0-3	Syngenta	The most recent JMPR evaluation for toxicology of propiconazole was in 2004. An ADI was set at 0.7 mg/kg bw/day (Reproductive toxicity in rats with safety factor of 100) and an ARFD at 0.3 mg/kg bw (Developmental toxicity in rats with safety factor of 100). Propiconazole was evaluated by EFSA in 2017. An ADI was set at 0.04 mg/kg bw/day (Chronic rat study with safety factor of 100) and an ARFD at 0.1 mg/kg bw (Developmental study in rat with safety factor of 300). EFSA could not finalise the consumer dietary risk assessment considering the outstanding data to finalise the residue definition for risk assessment for plants and the livestock exposure assessment. No conclusion could be drawn on the toxicity of several metabolites, even genotoxicity has not been studied for some of the metabolites. Endocrine effects of propiconazole have not been finalized. In addition, an acute intake concern was identified for European consumer from some existing and proposed CXLs. EFSA, 2017: Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance propiconazole. EFSA Journal 2017;15(7):4887- <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4887">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4887</a>	The 2021 JMPR meeting concluded that based on the information presented in the EU documentation, the potential concerns identified about dietary exposures to propiconazole and its metabolite were not substantiated and did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review.	To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab
81	Chlorothalonil	Yes	2015	0-0.02	0-6	Syngenta	EU: Chlorothalonil was initially evaluated by JMPR in 1990 and reviewed several times for toxicology and residues (last review in 2015). During the EU peer review, the consumer risk assessment could not be finalised in view of the multiple identified data gaps, leading to derivation of preliminary residue definitions in plant, including processed commodities, and in animal commodities. Since R182281 (SDS-3701) is a pertinent residue in all these commodities and in the absence of toxicological reference values for R182281, even an indicative consumer risk assessment using the preliminary residue definitions could not be conducted. It is noted that for R182281 a genotoxic potential could not be excluded. Moreover, under processing conditions employing higher temperatures, degradation of chlorothalonil into R613636 was observed next to formation of R182281. Also for R613636, a genotoxic potential could not be excluded. Further to that, a genotoxic potential could not be excluded for R417888, a medium to very high persistent soil metabolite that together with R611965 formed the major residue in the rotational crop metabolism study but was not investigated in rotational crop residue trials. In addition, the ARFD for parent has decreased to 0.05 mg/kg bw/day during the recent EU peer review. New toxicological studies were submitted during the EU peer review which have not been evaluated by the JMPR. It is suggested to schedule chlorothalonil and specifically its metabolites for toxicological and exposure assessment in light of these findings. EFSA, 2017: Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance chlorothalonil. EFSA Journal 2018;16(1):5126- <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5126">doi:10.2903/efsa.2018.5126</a> <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5126">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5126</a>	The 2021 JMPR meeting concluded that R613636 is unlikely to present a public health concern. The meeting concluded that, based on the information presented in the EU documentation, the potential public health concerns raised by the EU over dietary exposures to chlorothalonil and its metabolites had not been substantiated and that they did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review.	To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab
81	Chlorothalonil	Yes	2015	0-0.02	0-6	Syngenta	UK: The UK is concerned that the advancement of the proposed CXL for cranberries is not appropriate on the basis of the points set out below, and requests additional clarification and assurance on the scientific basis for the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The chronic exposure estimated for the metabolite R613636 exceeded the threshold below which no adverse effects for human health are expected.</li> <li>The overall chronic exposure to the metabolite R613636 from all commodities has not been addressed.</li> <li>The acute exposure to the metabolite R613636 has not been addressed.</li> </ul> The metabolite R613636 was found to be a major degradation product on hydrolysis of chlorothalonil and therefore has the potential to be found in processed cranberries, in particular the residue levels in cranberry juice and sauce, rather than the fresh cranberries, is of a concern. The chronic exposure to this metabolite has been estimated on the basis of the hydrolysis study. The OECD test guideline 507 outlines the purposes of the hydrolysis study, which includes information on the nature of the residue in processed foods. The study is not designed to be used to estimate the magnitude of residue levels in processed foods. The levels of the metabolite R613636 in processed cranberries should be based on magnitude studies (i.e. OECD test guideline 508). The FAO manual is also clear that the purpose of the hydrolysis study is to determine whether or not breakdown or reaction products of residues in the raw commodities are formed during processing which may require a separate risk assessment. Processing factors derived under realistic conditions are required for MRL setting and/or refinement of the consumer exposure assessment. The UK would accept that using the hydrolysis study to provide an estimate of the exposure level would be an acceptable approach under specific circumstances. For example if the exposures estimated were significantly below the toxicological reference values or the generic threshold. However, in this specific case the exposures were above the generic threshold and therefore data generated on the residue levels in processed cranberries (or suitable surrogates) would ensure more accurate exposures for the metabolite can be determined. This would provide the evidence to support the JMPR statement that there are unlikely to be public health concerns, even though the exposure exceeds the threshold, as it seems very unlikely that the daily diet contains a high percentage (> 50%) of cranberries subject to high temperature treatment. Specific toxicological reference values could not be established for this metabolite owing to the lack of toxicological data. The acceptability of the chronic exposure has therefore been assessed using the TTC (threshold of toxicological concern). The chronic exposure estimated by the JMPR exceeded the generic threshold of 1.5 µg/kg bw/day (for compounds categorised in Cramer class III). In the Codex Alimentarius Commission procedural manual (27th edition) if either the IESTIs exceed the ARFD or the IEDIs exceed the ADI the JMPR should indicate additional data are necessary to refine the calculations. The same approach should be taken when the acceptability of the exposures have been determined on the basis of a generic threshold as analytical specific toxicological reference values cannot be established. The UK fully supports the use of the TTC to determine the acceptability of the exposure to this metabolite. The TTC provides a conservative exposure threshold in the absence of sufficient chemical specific toxicological data. However, a fundamental principle of using the TTC is that where exposures are below the threshold further data are not required and where the exposures exceed the threshold then it must be a priority to provide further data. Setting additional thresholds above the established threshold is not appropriate for MRL setting and could undermine confidence in the codex MRLs. In this specific case, as the exposure for the metabolite has only been estimated using the hydrolysis study, with no actual crop treated, there are additional uncertainties. In addition, Codex MRLs are currently established for a wide range of crops which can be processed. The new data assessed by the	The resulting maximum IESTI for cranberry (all commodities) was 3.51 µg/kg bw. A single exposure TTC for Cramer class III compounds of 5 µg/kg bw was proposed by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA-2012). The Meeting considered that this is precautionary and appropriate for use in assessing acute intakes of R613636. As a result, the acute exposure to R613636 in cranberry commodities is not expected to be a public health concern.	To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab

17	Chlorpyrifos	Yes	1982 (T), 1995 (R), 1999 (T), 2000 (R), 2004 (R), 2006 (R)	0-0.01	0.1	Corteva Agriscience (May 2020 advised unsupported). Adama to advise on supported commodities.	<p>Chlorpyrifos was originally evaluated by JMPR in 1972. It was evaluated for toxicology in 1982 by JMPR and for residues in 1995 and it was reviewed for toxicology in 1999 (confirmed ADI of 0-0.01 mg/kg bw and ARfD 0.1 mg/kg bw) and for residues in 2000, 2004 and 2006.</p> <p>There is a 20 years' gap since chlorpyrifos was last reviewed by JMPR, as it is also indicated in General considerations (point 2.6) of 2019 Report of the extra Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues.</p> <p>During the 2019 EU Peer Review of the active substance, and based on the information available from the European Food Safety Authority's Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment of the active substance chlorpyrifos, concerns were identified with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The genotoxic potential of chlorpyrifos which cannot be ruled out based on the information available: positive findings were found in an in vitro chromosome aberration study and two in vitro unscheduled DNA synthesis assays; in vivo positive findings were found in open literature on chromosome aberration and on DNA damage caused through oxidative stress or by topoisomerase II inhibition, which is considered a molecular initiating event for infant leukaemia. Consequently, health based reference values cannot be established for chlorpyrifos and the dietary and non-dietary risk assessments cannot be conducted.</li> <li>•Developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) effects were observed in the available study on developmental neurotoxicity in rats (adverse effects were seen at the lowest dose tested in rats and a no observed adverse effects level 'NOAEL' could not be established) and epidemiological evidence exists showing an association between exposure to chlorpyrifos and/or chlorpyrifos-methyl during development and adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes in children.</li> <li>•Based on the evidence for DNT, experts during the peer review suggested that classification of chlorpyrifos as toxic for reproduction, category 1B, H360D 'May damage the unborn child', in accordance with the criteria set out in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 would be appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>For all these reasons, it is considered that a re-evaluation for toxicology and residues of chlorpyrifos and all their CXLs is necessary and this task should be prioritized on the JMPR calendar. It was noted that aspects of epidemiology should be included. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2019. Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment in the context of the pesticides peer review of the active substance chlorpyrifos. EFSA Journal 2019;17(5):5809 DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5809 <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5809">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5809</a></p>	<p>Given the concerns identified by the 2019 JMPR the 2021 JMPR meeting urged that chlorpyrifos should be re-evaluated as soon as possible. It was noted that findings from recent epidemiology studies would need to be assessed. The meeting noted that CCPR has scheduled chlorpyrifos and chlorpyrifos-methyl for periodic evaluation by the 2024 JMPR.</p>	<p>At CCPR53 the Committee agreed to remove chlorpyrifos CXLs</p>
90	Chlorpyrifos methyl	Yes	1975, 2009	0-0.01	0.1	Corteva Agriscience (May 2020 advised unsupported)	<p>Chlorpyrifos-methyl was originally evaluated by the JMPR in 1975. It was evaluated for both, toxicology and residues in 1991 by JMPR and it was reviewed for toxicology in 1992 and 2001 (ADI of 0-0.01 mg/kg bw/day and ARfD unnecessary) and for residues in 1993, 1994, 2009 and 2013.</p> <p>During the 2019 EU Peer Review of the active substance, and based on the information available from the European Food Safety Authority's Statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment of chlorpyrifos methyl, concerns were identified with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The genotoxic potential of chlorpyrifos-methyl, which cannot be ruled out when taking into account the concerns raised for chlorpyrifos concerning chromosome aberration and DNA damage that may also apply to chlorpyrifos-methyl. In addition, the available scientific open literature on chlorpyrifos-methyl, although presenting some limitations, should be considered in a weight of evidence approach and raises some concerns about the potential for chlorpyrifos-methyl to damage DNA. Consequently, health based reference values cannot be established for chlorpyrifos-methyl and the dietary and non-dietary risk assessments cannot be conducted.</li> <li>• Developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) – the available DNT study on chlorpyrifos-methyl did not allow for a full assessment of effects on brain development, in particular since effects on cerebellum height could not be evaluated due to the lack of controls in females and a no observed adverse effects level 'NOAEL' for DNT could not be established. Since DNT effects were observed in the available developmental neurotoxicity on chlorpyrifos (adverse effects were seen at the lowest dose tested in rats and a NOAEL could not be established) concerns exist also for chlorpyrifos-methyl. Moreover, epidemiological evidence exists showing an association between exposure to chlorpyrifos and/or chlorpyrifos-methyl during development and adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes in children.</li> <li>•Based on the evidence for developmental neurotoxicity (DNT), experts during the peer review suggested that classification of chlorpyrifos-methyl as toxic for the reproduction category 1B, H360D 'May damage the unborn child', in accordance with the criteria set out in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 would be appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>For all these reasons, it is considered that a re-evaluation for toxicology and residues of chlorpyrifos methyl and all their CXLs is necessary and this task should be prioritized on JMPR calendar. It was noted that aspects of epidemiology should be included. European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), 2019. Updated statement on the available outcomes of the human health assessment in the context of the pesticides peer review of the active substance chlorpyrifos-methyl. EFSA Journal 2019;17(11):5908. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5908. <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5908">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5908</a></p>	<p>The 2021 JMPR meeting noted that CCPR has scheduled chlorpyrifos and chlorpyrifos-methyl for periodic evaluation by the 2024 JMPR.</p>	<p>At CCPR53 the Committee agreed to separate review from chlorpyrifos</p>
201	Chlorpropham	potato	2000, 2005T (ADI, ARfD)	0-0.05	0.5	Cerex Agri	<p>Chlorpropham was first evaluated by JMPR in 2000 (toxicology) and 2001 (residues) and reviewed for toxicology (ADI, ARfD) in 2005 and residues (milk, milk fat) in 2008. During the EU peer review, a final consumer risk assessment could not be finalised due to a number of data gaps. Metabolite 3-chloroaniline was identified in metabolism studies on stored potatoes treated with chlorpropham and in processing studies. For chlorpropham an acceptable daily intake (ADI) of 0.05 mg/kg bw per day and an acute reference dose (ARD) of 0.5 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. For 3-chloroaniline an ADI of 0.007 mg/kg bw per day and an ARfD of 0.03 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. In an indicative assessment, the highest chronic exposure to chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) in relation to a calculated MRL of 20 mg/kg was exceeding the ADI (180%). The chronic exposure to 3-chloroaniline was also exceeding the ADI (195%). In an acute risk assessment, the ARfD was exceeded by 797% for chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) and 2360% for 3-chloroaniline. Based on the above risk assessment a CXL of 30 mg/kg for potatoes cannot be supported.</p>	<p>Previously appeared on Table 1-2023&amp;beyond-new use-other spreadsheet with no more details than this.</p>	
167	Terbufos (167)	All CXLs	2003T			Unsupported	<p>The European Union is aware of a recent Canadian notification of the active substance terbufos to the Rotterdam Convention (PIC Procedure). The Canadian authorities derived an ADI of 0.00015 mg/kg bw/d (4 times lower than the JMPR ADI) and an ARfD of 0.00015 mg/kg bw, being more than 10 times lower than the JMPR derived ARfD. On this basis, the MRL for terbufos in bananas is no longer safe within the EU (ARfD more than 1200%).</p> <p>**JMPR (2004) [author: JMPR 2003]</p> <p>Acute reference dose (ARfD): 0.002 mg/kg bw</p> <p>The Meeting established an acute RfD of 0.002 mg/kg bw based on a NOAEL of 0.15 mg/kg bw per day for miosis in the study of neurotoxicity in rats given a single dose of terbufos, and a 100-fold safety factor. Since only in this study miosis was observed in the absence of inhibition of cholinesterase activity, it may be possible to refine the acute RfD after better characterization of this effect.</p> <p>Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI): 0-0.0006 mg/kg bw</p> <p>The Meeting established an ADI of 0-0.0006 mg/kg bw based on an overall NOAEL of 0.06 mg/kg bw per day and a safety factor of 100 for inhibition of brain cholinesterase activity in a 1-year toxicity study in rats, 13-week study of neurotoxicity and two-generation study of reproduction in rats, and 1-year study in dogs.</p> <p>Canadian risk evaluation [author: 2004]:</p> <p>Acute reference dose (ARfD): 0.00015 mg/kg bw</p> <p>In animal studies, the adverse effects noticeable at the lowest dose (i.e., the toxicity end point) were clinical signs observed in an acute rat neurotoxicity study (NOAEL = 0.15 mg/kg bw). The uncertainty factor was 100 (10x for interspecies extrapolation x 10x intraspecies variability). An additional safety factor of 10x was applied to account for the steepness of the dose response and the high degree of potency (based on lethality at very low doses). The acute reference dose (ARD) was calculated to be 0.00015 mg/kg bw (0.15 mg/kg bw ÷ 1000). This value was considered to be protective of infants and children.</p> <p>Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI): 0.00015 mg/kg bw/d</p> <p>As the ARfD value was lower than any acceptable daily intake (ADI) derived from any of the repeat-dose toxicity studies (reflecting the high acute toxicity and use of the additional safety factor), the ADI was established at the same value as the ARfD. Thus, the ADI is 0.00015 mg/kg bw/d." It is noted that the last toxicological re-evaluation by JMPR was 19 years ago.</p>		

HISTORICAL AND RESOLVED PHC - FOR RECORD ONLY									
CODE	COMPOUND	CURRENT NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	MANUFACTURER	COMMENT		
173	Buprofezin	Yes	2008	0-0.009, 2008	0.5, 2008	Nihon Nohyaku	The toxicological profile of the active substance was investigated under the Peer Review and data were sufficient to conclude on an ADI value of 0.01 mg/kg bw/day and an ARfD of 0.5 mg/kg bw/day. Parent buprofezin was shown to be the major constituent of the residues, accounting for 47 to 89 % of the TRR, with minor additional metabolites (BF-09, BF-12 and BF-026). However, under standard hydrolysis conditions simulating pasteurisation, boiling and sterilisation, buprofezin was significantly degraded to aniline (up to 19% AR). The potential exposure to aniline as a residue should be considered a priori as a concern since a threshold for a genotoxic carcinogen cannot be assumed. The European Union is in the process of deleting buprofezin MRLs. The 2019 JMPR review concluded that the predicted exposures to aniline from residues of buprofezin in commodities, which are subsequently processed, did not represent a public health concern (see 5.5 of the 2019 JMPR Report).		
258	Picoxystrobin	Yes	2012	0.09	0.043	Corteva	Picoxystrobin was evaluated by JMPR in 2012. In the EU, the last toxicological evaluation by EFSA (2016) stated that: - the setting of reference values and the finalisation of human health risk assessment could not be conducted, as no conclusion on the genotoxic potential of picoxystrobin could be drawn (Picoxystrobin was positive in the in vitro mammalian gene mutation assay); - the clastogenic and aneugenic potential of the metabolite IN-H8612 found as residue cannot be excluded; - the compliance of the toxicity studies compared to the technical specification and the relevance of impurities should be reconsidered once the genotoxic potential of picoxystrobin is properly addressed; and - data gaps concerning the toxicological profile of metabolites, in vitro comparative metabolism studies and further data to address the endocrine disruption potential of picoxystrobin lead to issues that could not be finalised. Plant and animal residue definitions for risk assessment could not be proposed pending submission of further data to address the toxicity of some metabolites. As toxicological reference values could not be proposed for the active substance, a consumer risk assessment could not be performed. The 2019 JMPR found that JMPR and EFSA differ in their interpretations of the genotoxicity data for picoxystrobin and IN-H8612. At the 2012 and 2013 Meetings, the WHO panel of JMPR included a specialist genotoxicity expert. The specification issue is outside the remit of the JMPR, is considered to be of questionable relevance to residues in treated commodities, but could be referred to the JMPR. The meeting noted the lack of information on EU specific requirements such as "endocrine disruption". Within the EU framework, endocrine disruption is a hazard identification process but JMPR includes these aspects as part of their risk assessments. The meeting concluded that the concerns identified about dietary exposures to picoxystrobin were unlikely to represent a public health concern.		
160	Propiconazole	Yes	2004	0-0.07	0.3	Syngenta	The most recent JMPR evaluation for toxicology of propiconazole was in 2004. An ADI was set at 0.7 mg/kg bw/day (Reproductive toxicity in rats with safety factor of 100) and an ARfD at 0.3 mg/kg bw (Developmental toxicity in rats with safety factor of 100). Propiconazole was evaluated by EFSA in 2017. An ADI was set at 0.04 mg/kg bw/day (Chronic rat study with safety factor of 100) and an ARfD at 0.1 mg/kg bw (Developmental study in rat with safety factor of 300). EFSA could not finalise the consumer dietary risk assessment considering the outstanding data to finalise the residue definition for risk assessment for plants and the livestock exposure assessment. No conclusion could be drawn on the toxicity of several metabolites, even genotoxicity has not been studied for some of the metabolites. Endocrine effects of propiconazole have not been finalised. In addition, an acute intake concern was identified for European consumer from some existing and proposed CXLs. EFSA, 2017: Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance propiconazole. EFSA Journal 2017;15(7):4887. <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4887">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4887</a>	The 2021 JMPR meeting concluded that based on the information presented in the EU documentation, the potential concerns identified about dietary exposures to propiconazole and its metabolite were not substantiated and did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review.	To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab
81	Chlorothalonil	Yes	2015	0-0.02	0.6	Syngenta	EU: Chlorothalonil was initially evaluated by JMPR in 1990 and reviewed several times for toxicology and residues (last review in 2015). During the EU peer review, the consumer risk assessment could not be finalised in view of the multiple identified data gaps, leading to derivation of preliminary residue definitions in plant, including processed commodities, and in animal commodities. Since R182281 (SDS-3701) is a pertinent residue in all these commodities and in the absence of toxicological reference values for R182281, even an indicative consumer risk assessment using the preliminary residue definitions could not be conducted. It is noted that for R182281 a genotoxic potential could not be excluded. Moreover, under processing conditions employing higher temperatures, degradation of chlorothalonil into R613636 was observed next to formation of R182281. Also for R613636, a genotoxic potential could not be excluded. Further to that, a genotoxic potential could not be excluded for R417888, a medium to very high persistent soil metabolite that together with R611965 formed the major residue in the rotational crop metabolism study but was not investigated in rotational crop residue trials. In addition, the ARfD for parent has decreased to 0.05 mg/kg bw/day during the recent EU peer review. New toxicological studies were submitted during the EU peer review which have not been evaluated by the JMPR. It is suggested to schedule chlorothalonil and specifically its metabolites for toxicological and exposure assessment in light of these findings. EFSA, 2017. Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance chlorothalonil. EFSA Journal 2018;16(1):5126. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5126 <a href="https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5126">https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5126</a>	The 2021 JMPR meeting concluded that R613636 is unlikely to present a public health concern. The meeting concluded that, based on the information presented in the EU documentation, the potential public health concerns raised by the EU over dietary exposures to chlorothalonil and its metabolites had not been substantiated and that they did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review.	To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab

81	Chlorothalonil	Yes	2015	0-0.02	0.6	Syngenta	<p>UK: The UK is concerned that the advancement of the proposed CXL for cranberries is not appropriate on the basis of the points set out below, and requests additional clarification and assurance on the scientific basis for the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The chronic exposure estimated for the metabolite R613636 exceeded the threshold below which no adverse effects for human health are expected</li> <li>•The overall chronic exposure to the metabolite R613636 from all commodities has not been addressed</li> <li>•The acute exposure to the metabolite R613636 has not been addressed</li> </ul> <p>The metabolite R613636 was found to be a major degradation product on hydrolysis of chlorothalonil and therefore has the potential to be found in processed cranberries. In particular the residue levels in cranberry juice and sauce, rather than the fresh cranberries, is of a concern.</p> <p>The chronic exposure to this metabolite has been estimated on the basis of the hydrolysis study.</p> <p>The OECD test guideline 507 outlines the purposes of the hydrolysis study, which includes information on the nature of the residue in processed foods. The study is not designed to be used to estimate the magnitude of residue levels in processed foods. The levels of the metabolite R613636 in processed cranberries should be based on magnitude studies (i.e. OECD test guideline 508).</p> <p>The FAO manual is also clear that the purpose of the hydrolysis study is to determine whether or not breakdown or reaction products of residues in the raw commodities are formed during processing which may require a separate risk assessment. Processing factors derived under realistic conditions are required for MRL setting and/or refinement of the consumer exposure assessment.</p> <p>The UK would accept that using the hydrolysis study to provide an estimate of the exposure level would be an acceptable approach under specific circumstances. For example if the exposures estimated were significantly below the toxicological reference values or the generic threshold.</p> <p>However, in this specific case the exposures were above the generic threshold and therefore data generated on the residue levels in processed cranberries (or suitable surrogates) would ensure more accurate exposures for the metabolite can be determined. This would provide the evidence to support the JMPR statement that there are unlikely to be public health concerns, even though the exposure exceeds the threshold, as it seems very unlikely that the daily diet contains a high percentage (&gt; 50 %) of cranberries subject to high temperature treatment.</p> <p>Specific toxicological reference values could not be established for this metabolite owing to the lack of toxicological data. <b>PHC never submitted? JMPR has not confirmed that a periodic review is necessary. Chlorpropham was first evaluated by JMPR in 2000 (toxicology) and 2001 (residues) and reviewed for toxicology (ADI, ARfD) in 2005 and residues (milk, milk fat) in 2008. During the EU peer review, a final consumer risk assessment could not be finalised due to a number of data gaps. Metabolite 3-chloroaniline was identified in metabolism studies on stored potatoes treated with chlorpropham and in processing studies. For chlorpropham an acceptable daily intake (ADI) of 0.05 mg/kg bw per day and an acute reference dose (ARfD) of 0.5 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. For 3-chloroaniline an ADI of 0.007 mg/kg bw per day and an ARfD of 0.03 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. In an indicative assessment, the highest chronic exposure to chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) in relation to a calculated MRL of 20 mg/kg was exceeding the ADI (180%). The chronic exposure to 3-chloroaniline was also exceeding the ADI (195%). In an acute risk assessment, the ARfD was exceeded by 797% for chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) and 2360% for 3-chloroaniline. Based on the above risk assessment a</b></p>	<p>The resulting maximum IESTI for cranberry (all commodities) was 3.51 µg/kg bw. A single exposure TTC for Cramer class III compounds of 5 µg/kg bw was proposed by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA 2012). The Meeting considered that this is precautionary and appropriate for use in assessing acute intakes of R613636. As a result, the acute exposure to R613636 in cranberry commodities is not expected to be a public health concern.</p>	<p>To be moved to Historical resolved PHC tab</p>
	Chlorpropham (201)	Yes	2000, 2005T (ADI, ARfD)	0-0.05	0.5	Cerex Agri UPL	<p>Specific toxicological reference values could not be established for this metabolite owing to the lack of toxicological data. <b>PHC never submitted? JMPR has not confirmed that a periodic review is necessary. Chlorpropham was first evaluated by JMPR in 2000 (toxicology) and 2001 (residues) and reviewed for toxicology (ADI, ARfD) in 2005 and residues (milk, milk fat) in 2008. During the EU peer review, a final consumer risk assessment could not be finalised due to a number of data gaps. Metabolite 3-chloroaniline was identified in metabolism studies on stored potatoes treated with chlorpropham and in processing studies. For chlorpropham an acceptable daily intake (ADI) of 0.05 mg/kg bw per day and an acute reference dose (ARfD) of 0.5 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. For 3-chloroaniline an ADI of 0.007 mg/kg bw per day and an ARfD of 0.03 mg/kg bw per day were proposed. In an indicative assessment, the highest chronic exposure to chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) in relation to a calculated MRL of 20 mg/kg was exceeding the ADI (180%). The chronic exposure to 3-chloroaniline was also exceeding the ADI (195%). In an acute risk assessment, the ARfD was exceeded by 797% for chlorpropham (including metabolite 4-hydroxychlorpropham) and 2360% for 3-chloroaniline. Based on the above risk assessment a</b></p>	potato	

<b>Code</b>	<b>Chemical</b>	<b>Comments</b>
49	Malathion	Apple; citrus; grapes (EU GAP no longer supported by EU)
39	Fenthion	Cherry; citrus fruits; olive oil (virgin); olives (EU GAP no longer supported by EU)

2023 - PERIODIC REVIEW - UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS									
YEAR	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMODITIES	COMMENTS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	ADI	ARFD	RECOMMENDED FOR CXL REMOVAL
2020?	Fenbutatin oxide (109)	Fenbutatin oxide (109)			National registrations - Y¶No supporting member country ¶No longer supported by manufacturer	1992T, 1993R	0.03, 1992	N/A	DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPRR52 2021 TO DETERMINE IF SPONSOR COULD BE FOUND
	Amitraz (122)	Amitraz (122)			Arysta Lifesciences; possible deletion	1980, 1998T	0.01 (1998)	0.01 (1998)	DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCPRR52 2021 TO DETERMINE IF SPONSOR COULD BE FOUND
2020?	Bromide ion (47)	Bromide ion (47)		Not supported	No Crop life-manufacturer-responsible ¶Last-reviewed over 25-years ago – Not-cleared-toxicologically by JMPR ¶Bromide ion from all sources but not including-covalently-bound-bromine, Methyl-bromide (52) – guideline CXLs	1988	1.0, 1998	N/A	Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR-pesticide list
	Bromopropylate (70)	Bromopropylate (70)		Not supported	Possible deletion	1973, 1993	0.03 (1993)	N/A	Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR-pesticide list
	Dichloran (83)	PHC LODGED, moved to TABLE 2B		Not supported	Gowan previously?; possible deletion	1974, 1998	0.01, 1998	NR 2003	Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR-pesticide list
	Fenarimol (192)	Fenarimol (192)		Not supported	Possible deletion	1995	0.01, 1995		Unsupported. To be added to the list of compounds removed from the CCPR-pesticide list
	Carbaryl (008)	Carbaryl (008)		Not supported	Scheduled for tox review 2019	1965, 2001T(ADI, ARFD), 2002R	0.006, 2001	0.2, 2001	Thailand indicated support for FI 4137 (Mangosteen, 6 trials), FI 0342 (Longan, 3 trials), FI 0345 (Mango, 3 trials)
	2-phenylphenol (056)	2-phenylphenol (056)		Not supported		1999	0.4, 1999	NR 1999	
	Dinocap (087)	Dinocap (087)		Not supported		1969, 1998T, 2000T(ARFD)	0.008, 1998	0.008 WCBA - 0.03 general	
	Methamidophos (100)	Methamidophos (100)		Not supported		1976, 2002T, 2003R	0.004, 2002	0.01, 2002	
	Bitertanol (144)	Bitertanol (144)		Not supported		1983, 1998T, 1999R	0.01, 1998	NR 1998	
	Terbufos (167)	Terbufos (167)		Not supported		1989, 2003T	0.0006, 1989	0.002, 2003	
2022 (delayed due to backlog)	Fenthion (39)	Fenthion (39)		Not supported		1971, 1995, 1997T(ARFD)	0.007, 1995	0.01, 1997	